

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 28, 2004, Claims 1-42, of which Claims 1, 14, and 35 are independent, are pending. Claims 1-13 are allowed. The drawings are objected to due to various alleged informalities. The specification is objected to due to various alleged informalities. Claims 14 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 14-24, 27-35, and 38-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over alleged "Applicants' admitted prior art," hereinafter referred to as "AAPA" further in view of Townsley et al. (*Layer Two Tunneling Protocol "L2TP"*, draft-ietf-pppext-12-tp-16.txt, June 1999). In addition, Claims 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Townsley as applied to Claim 14 above, and further in view of Mahler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,504). Claims 25 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Various alleged informalities in the specification have been corrected. Formal drawings are provided herewith to correct various alleged informalities. Claims 14-24, 27-35, and 38-42 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 25 and 36 have been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of Claims 1-13.

In view of the remarks above, Applicants' respectfully submit that the present application, including Claims 1-13, 25-26, and 36-37 is in condition for allowance and solicits action to that end. If there are any additional matters that may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff

Date: January 28, 2005

By: 

Thomas E. Wettermann

Reg. No. 41,523

30 **II. IN THE DRAWINGS**

 Figures 1 and 3 are objected to as allegedly failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference character(s) not mentioned in the description. In addition, Figures 1 and 2 are objected to because they fail to designate a legend such as --Prior Art--. Moreover, Figure 4 stands objected to since the numerals of the Specification do not correspond
35 with Figure 4. Formal drawings are herewith provided.